







United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Bux 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/905,531	07/13/2001	Ellis Junior Smith	DEE6270P0090US	DEE6270P0090US 3484	
75	590 07/31/2003				
POLIT & ASSOCIATES, LLC			EXAMINER		
3333 WARRENVILLE ROAD SUITE 520			LOPEZ, FI	RANK D	
LISLE, IL 605	032		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3745	/1	
			DATE MAILED: 07/31/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			pu
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/905,531	SMITH ET AL.	
, at record , record	Examiner	Art Unit	
	F. Daniel Lopez	3745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 17 Juky 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti IE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the feet of the first of the control of	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate of the final originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
$3. \square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer			
10. Other:	(),()		
		F. Daniel Lopez Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3745	y y

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)





Continuation of 2. NOTE: the single lever is a new issue. Balzer shows a single lever, but Jenkins does not; therfore the claims rejected by Jenkins, and not Balzer would need further consideration .